

## Morag Hamilton

---

**From:** Sue Ruston <Sue.Ruston@fonterra.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 January 2015 1:34 p.m.  
**Subject:** V2 pCLWRP Further Submission - Fonterra  
**Attachments:** pCLWRP V2 - further submissions - Fonterra - Final.pdf

**To** **Canterbury Regional Council**

- Please find attached a further submission from Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited with respect to V2 pCLWRP.

**To:** **Synlait Farms Ltd; Ashburton District Council; Central South Island Fish and Game Council; Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group; DairyNZ; Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch; Ashburton Hinds Drainage Rating District Liaison Committee; Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership; Irrigation New Zealand; Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Ltd; Synlait Milk Ltd; Dairy Holdings Ltd; Rangitata Diversion Race Management Limited; Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme; P Everest and Others; Director General of Conservation; Barrhill Chertsey Irrigation Scheme; Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Ltd; Nga Rununga and te Rununga O Ngai Tahu; and Valetta Irrigation Ltd**

- Please find attached by way of service the further submission from Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited with respect to V2 pCLWRP

If you have any queries with respect to this further submission, please contact me directly.

Best regards

Sue Ruston

Environmental Policy Manager

**Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited**

[sue.ruston@fonterra.com](mailto:sue.ruston@fonterra.com)

direct +64 4 913 9354, mobile +64 27 702 4976, fax +64 4 494 0739

PO Box 417, Wellington, Area code 6140, Level 12, 157 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011, New Zealand

[www.fonterra.com](http://www.fonterra.com)



---

### DISCLAIMER

This email contains information that is confidential and which may be legally privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the email. This email is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient and you may not use or disclose this email in any way.

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS OF FONTERRA CO-OPERATIVE GROUP LIMITED ON  
SUBMISSIONS ON THE PROPOSED VARIATION 2  
TO THE CANTERBURY LAND AND WATER REGIONAL PLAN**

**To** Canterbury Regional Council

**1. Name of person making further submission:**

Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited.

**2. These further submissions are in support of or in opposition to (as specified in the attached table) submissions on the following proposed plan (the proposal):**

Variation 2 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan.

**3. Fonterra is a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has:**

Fonterra's shareholders produce, and the Co-operative collects and processes, over 3.5 billion litres of milk annually from the Canterbury Region. The region makes up near on 20% of Fonterra's total milk supply. The provisions of Variation 2 to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan will affect the manner, extent and cost of milk production in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains area of the Canterbury Region and milk processing in Canterbury. This will have broader social and economic implications for the Ashburton District and the Canterbury Region as a whole.

It is noted that Canterbury Regional Council is treating the submissions and further submissions to the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (the initial submissions) as submissions and further submissions on this Variation. Fonterra considers that the Co-Operative's further submissions made during the Schedule 1 process on the proposed Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan provide adequate scope to address any issues or concerns that may arise in this Variation process. Fonterra has not therefore lodged any further submissions to the initial submissions as this will duplicate what has already been done.

**4. The attached table sets out:**

- (a) The submissions or parts of submissions that Fonterra supports or opposes;
- (b) Fonterra's reasons for support or opposition; and
- (c) The relief sought by Fonterra in relation to those submissions or parts of submissions.

**5. Fonterra wishes to be heard in support of its further submissions.**



---

Sue Ruston  
Environmental Policy Manager

29 January 2015

**Address for Service of Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited**

Sue Ruston  
Environmental Policy Manager  
Fonterra Co-operative Group Limited  
PO Box 417  
Wellington 6140

Telephone: (04) 913 9354  
Mobile: (027) 702 4976  
Email: [sue.ruston@fonterra.com](mailto:sue.ruston@fonterra.com)

**Policy 13.4.6**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Synlait Farms Ltd	56811 V2 pLWRP-988	Policy 13.4.6	Amend by adding <u>...will be left in the river until allocation is at or under catchment limit</u>	Support in part	<p>Once a water body is no longer over allocated then any surrendered water should be able to be reallocated.</p> <p>While the notified policy adopts this approach for the Hakatere/Ashburton River catchment, it prevents reallocation in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains area at any time. Once a catchment is no longer over allocated there is no apparent reason to prevent reallocation of water (up to but not exceeding allocation limits).</p> <p>We support the relief sought by Synlait Farms Ltd in so far as it is consistent with the policy approach we are seeking, however, we consider it can be drafted more concisely</p>	Accept that part of the submission that says that the water resulting from any surrendered surface water and stream depleting groundwater takes in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area will not be reallocated and will be left in the river until it is at or under catchment limits.
Ashburton District Council	56631 V2 pLWRP-225	Policy 13.4.6	Retain the policy.	Oppose	<p>Once a water body is no longer over allocated then any surrendered water should be able to be reallocated.</p> <p>While the notified policy adopts this approach for the Hakatere/Ashburton River catchment, it prevents reallocation in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains area at any time.</p>	Reject the submission.
Central South Island Fish and Game Council	53274 V2 pLWRP-402	Policy 13.4.6	Retain the policy.	Oppose	<p>Once a water body is no longer over allocated then any surrendered water should be able to be reallocated.</p> <p>While the notified policy adopts this approach for the Hakatere/Ashburton River catchment, it prevents reallocation in the</p>	Reject the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					Hinds/Hekeao Plains area at any time.	

**Policy 13.4.9 (b) and (c)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group	56707 V2 pLWRP-962	Policy 13.4.9(c)	Delete Policy 13.4.9(c). While UHPLUG supports carrying out practices which aim to minimise the entry of contaminants into surface water bodies, it is opposed to including a policy for restricting nitrogen losses in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area catchment where the water quality data indicates that nitrate toxicity in the surface waterways of the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area is not currently, and is unlikely in the future, to be an issue.	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds area are primarily from sediment, P and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen leaching and therefore managing water quality via controls on nitrogen losses is unnecessary and is not likely to be effective in managing water quality risks.  We support management of N loss (and other contaminants) through use of Farm Environment Plans, adoption of GMPs and in-stream contaminant (including DIN) concentration limits.	Accept the submission.
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-547 & V2 pLWRP-549	Policy 13.4.9 (c) & (b)	Delete Policy 13.4.9(c) and amend Policy 13.4.9(b) as follows: <i>Improving management of microbes, <b>nitrogen</b>, phosphorous, and sediment in both areas</i>	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds area are primarily from sediment, P and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen leaching and therefore managing water quality via controls on nitrogen losses is unnecessary and is not likely to be effective in managing water quality risks.  We support management of N loss (and other contaminants) through use of Farm Environment Plans, adoption of GMPs and in-stream contaminant (including DIN)	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					concentration limits. We also note that inclusion of Nitrogen in 13.4.9(b) supports improved management of N loss in the area, while not going as far as setting restrictions on N loss increases.	
Central South Island Fish and Game Council	53274 V2 pLWRP-403	Policy 13.4.9	Delete Policy 13.4.9 and replace with new text including (amongst other matters) provision that: <i>“...<del>(4) Increases in nitrogen leaching are prohibited...</del>”</i>	Oppose	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds area are primarily from sediment, P and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen leaching and therefore managing water quality via controls on nitrogen losses is unnecessary and is not likely to be effective in managing water quality risks. We support management of N loss (and other contaminants) through use of Farm Environment Plans, adoption of GMPs and in-stream contaminant (including DIN) concentration limits.	Reject the submission.

### Policy 13.4.9 (d)

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-550 and 552	Policy 13.4.9(d)	Amend policy 13.4.9(d) as follows: <i>Reducing overall nitrogen losses by <del>45</del> 30 percent in the lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area and adopting the use of managed aquifer recharge to augment groundwater and/or surface water.</i> Add a further Policy 13.4.9 (e) as	Support	We support the separation of policies that, on the one hand, look to the use of managed aquifer recharge (i.e. dilution) to help improve water quality from those policies that, on the other, set requirements for N loss reductions (i.e. restrictions on land use). Further, we consider that the percentage for N loss reductions (i.e. 45%) is incorrect	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>follows:</p> <p><u><i>Adopting the use of catchment scale mitigations for ground or surface water of the Hinds/Hekeao Plains, including augmentation, by way of managed aquifer recharge and targeted stream augmentation.</i></u></p>		<p>and over states what is needed from land users as part of the fuller package for achieving water quality objectives. We understand that the appropriate “all of catchment” nitrogen loss reduction target to be achieved by existing land use is 30%, and that a higher percentage reduction would only be needed if managed aquifer recharge was not used or was not successful.</p>	
Synlait Farms Ltd	56811 V2 pLWRP-989	Policy 13.4.9(d)	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Reducing overall nitrogen losses by <del>45</del> <u>30</u> percent in the lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area and adopting <del>the use of managed aquifer recharge to augment groundwater and/or surface water</del> <u>catchment scale mitigations</u></i></p>	Support in part	<p>We support the separation of policies that, on the one hand, look to the use of managed aquifer recharge (i.e. dilution) to help improve water quality from those policies that, on the other, set requirements for N loss reductions (i.e. restrictions on land use).</p> <p>Further, we consider that the percentage for N loss reductions (i.e. 45%) is incorrect and over states what is needed from land users as part of the fuller package for achieving water quality objectives. We understand that the appropriate “all of catchment” nitrogen loss reduction target to be achieved by existing land use is 30%, and that a higher percentage reduction would only be needed if managed aquifer recharge was not used or was not successful.</p> <p>We support the relief sought by Synlait Farms Ltd in so far as it is consistent with the policy approach we support, however we consider it can be drafted more</p>	Accept that part of the submission that changes 45 percent to 30 percent.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					concisely as set out in the relief sought by DairyNZ for this policy.	
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP - 281	Policy 13.4.9(d)	Amend the policy (especially part (d) to reflect realistic positions regarding the potential to reduce N discharge in the context of the lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area	Support	We consider that the percentage for N loss reductions (i.e. 45%) is incorrect and over states what is needed from land users as part of the fuller package for achieving water quality objectives. A lesser percentage reduction is appropriate.	Accept the submission
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 Plwrp-403	Policy 13.4.9(d)	They request that a 45% reduction in nitrogen leaching be achieved by 2030.	Oppose	<p>We support the separation of policies that, on the one hand, look to the use of managed aquifer recharge (i.e. dilution) to help improve water quality from those policies that, on the other, set requirements for N loss reductions (i.e. restrictions on land use).</p> <p>Further, we consider that the percentage for N loss reductions (i.e. 45%) is incorrect and over states what is needed from land users as part of the fuller package for achieving water quality objectives. We understand that the appropriate “all of catchment” nitrogen loss reduction target to be achieved by existing land use is less than 45% and that a 45% reduction would only be needed if managed aquifer recharge was not used, or was not successful.</p>	Reject the submission.

### **Policy 13.4.10**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
----------------	-------------------	-----------------------	------------	-----------------	---------	---------------



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Federated Farmers combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP - 282	Policy 13.4.10	Delete Part (a) unless it is accompanied by a satisfactory definition of what a drain is in the context of this rule.	Support	Provisions relating to stock exclusion should be clear and should prevent stock access only where it has a substantive adverse effect on water quality and aquatic habitat and where it can be practically implemented.	Accept the submission
Ashburton Hinds Drainage Rating District Liaison Committee	56687 V2 pLWRP - 1077	Policy 13.4.10	Provide clarification in the policy about which drains stock are to be excluded from.	Support	Provisions relating to stock exclusion should be clear and should prevent stock access only where it has a substantive adverse effect on water quality and aquatic habitat and where it can be practically implemented.	Accept the submission.
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274V2 pLWRP - 472	Policy 13.4.10	Amend policy to read: <i>Excluding cattle, pigs, and deer from surface waterbodies including drains and ephemeral waterbodies</i>	Oppose	Provisions relating to stock exclusion should be clear and should prevent stock access only where it has a substantive adverse effect on water quality and aquatic habitat and where it can be practically implemented.	Reject submission.

### **Policy 13.4.11**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP- 557	Policy 13.4.11	Amend as follows: <i>Maintain water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by <del>capping discharges of nitrogen at 144 tonnes of nitrogen per year</del> and requiring all farming activities to operate at good management</i>	Support	Risks to water quality and ecological health in the Upper Hinds area are affected by sediment, P, E.coli and N but that N is not the over-riding priority in management. Accordingly the policies should direct focus appropriately on managing all key risks rather than a single focus on an N load limit.	Accept the submission

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p><i>practice to <u>manage nutrient, microbial and sediment losses</u> <del>to maintain current phosphorus losses to achieve the limits in Table 13(ga).</del></i></p> <p>See submission for Table 13(ga).</p>		<p>Nevertheless, a mechanism is required to ensure N remains at levels that are not problematic. A DIN concentration limit, as contained within Table 13 (ga), will do that. Managing to achieve the limits in Table 13(ga) ensures that <i>all</i> the key risks to water quality in the Upper Hinds are considered.</p>	
Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group	56707 V2 pLWRP-965	Policy 13.4.11	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Maintain water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by <del>capping the discharges of nitrogen at 114 tonnes of nitrogen per year</del> and requiring all farming activities to operate at good management practice to maintain current phosphorus losses <u>to achieve the limits in Table 13(XX): Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area Limits.</u></i></p> <p><i>[NB: Table 13 (XX): Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Limits proposed to be inserted in Section 13.7.3 ].</i></p>	Support in part	<p>Risks to water quality and ecological health in the Upper Hinds area are affected by sediment, P, E.coli and N but that N is not the over-riding priority in management. Accordingly the policies should direct focus appropriately on managing all key risks rather than a single focus on an N load limit.</p> <p>Nevertheless, a mechanism is required to ensure N remains at levels that are not problematic. A DIN concentration limit, as contained within Table 13 (ga), will do that. Managing to achieve the limits in Table 13(ga) ensures that <i>all</i> the key risks to water quality in the Upper Hinds are considered.</p> <p>Further we consider the policy approach taken by the Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group can be drafted more concisely.</p> <p>We note that the Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group’s Table 13(XX) is consistent with Table 13(ga) referred to in DairyNZ’s submission.</p>	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of reference to a limit of 114 tonnes of nitrogen per year and proposes use of a table of limits for the Upper Hinds.

**Policy 13.4.12**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-558	Policy 13.4.12	Amend as follows <i>Improve water quality in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by reducing the discharge of nitrogen from farming activities to <del>achieve a</del> target load of 3400 tonnes of nitrogen per year 70% of the catchment load contributed by farming activities as at 1 October 2014 by 2035.</i>	Support	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).  We consider that the catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula rather than as a fixed tonnage.	Accept the submission.
Synlait Farms Ltd	56811 V2 pLWRP-993	Policy 13.4.12	Amend as follows: <i>Improve water quality in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by reducing the discharge of nitrogen from farming activities to <del>achieve a</del> target load of 3,400 tonnes of nitrogen per year 70% of the existing catchment load contributed by farming activities by 2035.</i>	Support	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).  We consider that the catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula rather than as a fixed tonnage.  Further we consider the policy approach taken by the Synlait Farms Ltd can be advanced by identifying a date from which the percentage reduction can be determined.	Accept the submission.
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP-298	Policy 13.4.12	Set a target percentage reduction in load, or Require a recalculation of target load to maintain a similar percentage of reduction in N losses if subsequent more accurate data shows the base	Support in part	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).  We consider that the catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula	Accept that part of the submission that proposes a target set as a percentage reduction in load.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			load is different than 4500 tonnes. Require standardized approach to use of Overseer and its operation and development.		rather than as a fixed tonnage.	
Irrigation New Zealand	52278 V2 Plwrp-173	Policy 13.4.12	Remove reference to catchment load limit and replace by referring to target concentration, or referring to a formula (whereby the limit can be regularly adjusted)	Support in part	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).  We consider that the catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula rather than as a fixed tonnage.	Accept that part of the submission that proposes a target load calculated using a methodology and which can be updated over time.
Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Ltd	56712 V2 pLWRP-374 & V2 pLWRP-371	Policy 13.4.12	With reference to Table 13(g) this submitter sought to lock in 5 yearly reviews of the Nitrogen Load limit to ensure it is still appropriate to achieve the outcomes in Table 13(a) &  Include a proviso that further reductions are not required if water quality outcomes are being met and/or if further reductions from any particular activity will not contribute to further water quality improvements (provided GMP rates are being achieved) &  Lock in 5 yearly reviews of any reduction proposed to ensure they are still appropriate to achieve the nitrogen load limit in Table 13(g) or other relevant water quality	Support	We support policy that provides for continuous review of the limits and N loss requirements; and that ceases the obligation to reduce N loss when in-stream/groundwater outcomes are being met (allowing for lag times).	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			attributes of the load target is deleted.			
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-474	Policy 13.4.12	That the 3400 tonne/yr load limit be replaced by in-stream targets relating to DIN and DRP – however these are not specified.	Oppose	The submission provides insufficient detail to assess the effect of the proposal. The existing freshwater outcomes of Table 13(a) together with the limits of Tables 13(g), 13(j) and 13(k) provide a sufficient framework for managing nutrient contaminant risks.	Reject the submission.

### Policy 13.4.13(a)

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-559	13.4.13(a)	Amend as follows: <i>Farming activities including farm enterprises in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area whether or not they are supplied with water by an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier, achieve a target load <u>calculated as 70% of catchment load contributed by farming activities as at 1 October 2014 of 3400 tonnes of nitrogen per year</u> by:</i> <i>a) Requiring existing farming activities to <u>implement meet</u> good management practices <u>nitrogen loss rates</u> from 1 January 2017; <u>calculated on the baseline land</u></i>	Support	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer). The catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula rather than a fixed tonnage. With particular respect to 13.4.13(a), it is not appropriate to imply that there are specific quantified GMP rates that need to be complied with when these do not exist yet and hence their appropriateness cannot be tested through the submission/hearing process.	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<i>uses;</i>			
Synlait Milk Ltd	54491 V2 pLWRP-234	13.4.13(a)	Amend as follows: <i>Farming activities including farm enterprises in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area whether or not they are supplied with water by an irrigation scheme or a principal water supplier, achieve a target load <u>calculated as 70% of catchment load contributed by farming activities as at 1 October 2014 of 3400 tonnes of nitrogen per year</u> by:</i> <i>a) Requiring existing farming activities to <del>implement</del> meet good management practices <u>nitrogen loss rates</u> from 1 January 2017; <u>calculated on the baseline land uses;</u></i>	Support	A catchment load limit should not be “locked in” when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer). The catchment load should be expressed in policy as a formula rather than a fixed tonnage. With particular respect to 13.4.13(a), it is not appropriate to imply that there are specific quantified GMP rates that need to be complied with when these do not exist yet and hence their appropriateness cannot be tested through the submission/hearing process.	Accept the submission.

### Policy 13.4.13(b)

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-559	13.4.13(b)	Amend as follows: <i>Requiring <u>a collective reduction in nitrogen loss from farming activities across the lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area for all properties with a nitrogen loss calculation exceeding 25 kg per</u></i>	Support	All farming activities should be treated the same i.e. there should be no land use discrimination when setting N loss requirements. Regardless of the farming activity, higher emitters should make greater N loss reductions than lower emitters.	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p><i>hectare per annum further reductions for dairy farming and dairy support from 1 January 2020, in accordance with Table 13(h); and</i></p> <p>And add a new related sub policy as follows</p> <p><i>c) Determining the extent and timing of nitrogen loss reductions to be achieved on individual farm properties from 1 January 2020 by:</i></p> <p><i>A. use of an expert farm systems advisory panel reviewing resource consent applications and any associated Farm Environment Plans and providing independent advice to Canterbury Regional Council about the opportunities for nitrogen loss mitigation given the individual circumstances of each farm property.</i></p> <p><i>B. having regard to the following matters in considering the individual circumstances of each farm property:</i></p> <p><i>i. The nitrogen baseline for the property and the level of any reductions already achieved from that baseline; and</i></p>		<p>The rule appropriately lists the reduction targets (Table 13 h) as matters of discretion (rather than as conditions of the rule). Hence some policy/criteria is required to guide the way in which that discretion is to be exercised. Note though this should focus on defining the limited circumstances under which a departure from the reduction schedule of Table 13(h) is warranted.</p> <p>In our view, departure from the reduction schedule of Table 13(h) may be appropriate in the circumstances described.</p>	

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>ii. Any natural or physical constraints to lower nitrogen leaching faced on-farm that are outside of a farmer's control; and</p> <p>iii. The level of investment in farm infrastructure and where a farm might be in the cycle of infrastructure replacement; and</p> <p>iv. The capital and operational costs of making nitrogen loss reductions and the benefit (in terms of maintaining a farm's financial sustainability) of spreading that investment over time.</p>			
Synlait Farms Ltd	56811 V2 pLWRP-994	13.4.13(b)	<p>Amend as follows:  <u>Requiring a collective reduction in nitrogen loss from farming activities across the lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area for all properties with a nitrogen loss calculation exceeding 25 kg per hectare per annum further reductions for dairy farming and dairy support from 1 January 2020, in accordance with Table 13(h); and</u></p>	Support	<p>All farming activities should be treated the same i.e. there should be no land use discrimination when setting N loss requirements.</p> <p>Regardless of the farming activity, higher emitters should make greater N loss reductions than lower emitters.</p> <p>The rule appropriately lists the reduction targets (Table 13 h) as matters of discretion (rather than as conditions of the rule). Hence some policy/criteria is required to guide the way in which that discretion is to</p>	Accept the submission.



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>And add a new related sub policy as follows</p> <p><i>c) Determining the extent and timing of nitrogen loss reductions to be achieved on individual farm properties from 1 January 2020 by:</i></p> <p><i>(i) use of an expert farm systems advisory panel reviewing resource consent applications and any associated Farm Environment Plans and providing independent advice to Canterbury Regional Council about the opportunities for nitrogen loss mitigation given the individual circumstances of each farm property.</i></p> <p><i>(ii) having regard to the following matters in considering the individual circumstances of each farm property:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The nitrogen baseline for the property and the level of any reductions already achieved from that baseline; and</i></li> <li><i>2. Any natural or physical constraints to lower nitrogen leaching faced on-farm that are outside of a farmer's control;</i></li> </ol>		<p>be exercised. Note though this should focus on defining the limited circumstances under which a departure from the reduction schedule of Table 13(h) is warranted.</p> <p>In our view, departure from the reduction schedule of Table 13(h) may be appropriate in the circumstances described.</p>	

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p><i>and</i></p> <p><i>3. The level of investment in farm infrastructure and where a farm might be in the cycle of infrastructure replacement; and</i></p> <p><i>4. The capital and operational costs of making nitrogen loss reductions and the benefit (in terms of maintaining a farm's financial sustainability) of spreading that investment over time.</i></p>			
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP-304	13.4.13(b)	Remove reference to dairy and dairy support	Support	<p>All farming activities should be treated the same i.e. there should be no land use discrimination when setting N loss requirements.</p> <p>Regardless of the farming activity, higher emitters should make greater N loss reductions than lower emitters.</p>	Accept submission

***Policy 13.4.13(c)***

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Dairy Holdings Ltd	53683 V2 pLWRP-987	Policy 13.4.13(c)	Delete 13.4.13(c)	Support	The amount of further intensification affects the extent of reductions required by existing farms. Further, there is uncertainty about how much of the 30,000ha is already	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					<p>“taken” by existing consents and hence what the effect of this policy might be on existing dischargers. The amount of intensification above the flexibility cap should be limited to that within the command area of consented irrigation schemes that is not yet irrigated.</p> <p>We believe that all farming activities should be treated the same i.e. there should be no discrimination when setting N loss requirements.</p>	
Rangtata Diversion Race Management Limited	56706 v2 pLWRP - 637	Policy 13.4.13(c)	Delete reference to the 27 kgN/ha/yr from paragraph (c) of Policy 13.4.13 and replace it with a rate (or rates) that is derived from a comprehensive and detailed investigation that employs the methodology set out in Annexure C to this submission	Support in part	<p>The amount of further intensification affects the extent of reductions required by existing farms. Further, there is uncertainty about how much of the 30,000ha is already “taken” by existing consents and hence what the effect of this policy might be on existing dischargers. The amount of intensification above the flexibility cap(s) should be limited to that within the command area of consented irrigation schemes that is not yet irrigated.</p> <p>We believe that all farming activities should be treated the same i.e. there should be no discrimination when setting N loss requirements.</p>	Accept that part of the submission that seeks the deletion of 27kgs and replacement with a rate (or rates) derived from comprehensive and detailed investigation.

**Policy 13.4.14**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-566	Policy 13.4.14	<p>Add a new Policy 13.4.14A as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Enable catchment scale mitigations that improve overall water quality in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area and improve reliability of supply for surface water takes, including:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(a) improving flows in the spring fed water bodies;</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(b) decreasing nitrate nitrogen concentrations in the Hinds River/Hekeao and spring fed waterbodies; or</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(c) enhancing in-stream habitat.</u></i></p> <p>And amend Policy 13.4.14 to state:</p> <p><i><u>Improve the flows in spring fed waterbodies and/or decrease nitrate nitrogen concentrations in the Hinds/Hekeao spring fed waterbodies and groundwater in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by enabling <u>Enable</u> managed aquifer recharge (MAR) and targeted stream augmentation (TSA), where <u>adverse effects can be appropriately managed.</u> In determining whether adverse effects can be appropriately managed Canterbury Regional</u></i></p>	Support in part	<p>The policy is unnecessarily limited to MAR and TSA while there are other catchment scale mitigations that could also improve overall water quality and should also be enabled.</p> <p>Further, the purpose of MAR and TSA should include improving water quality and in-stream habitat generally as well as reliability of supply for surface water takes.</p> <p>There is potential for increased flows and levels to adversely affect drainage in the lower catchment in the autumn through to spring. While increasing flows is an important part of the solutions package the potential for conflict/adverse effects on farming needs to be both acknowledged and carefully managed. Consultation with the community and land owners during development of projects will be valuable.</p>	Accept that part of the submission that seeks splitting Policy 13.4.14 into two policies and encouraging consultation and research in relation to MAR projects.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p><u>Council will:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Encourage consultation to be undertaken with affected communities and landholders before any application is lodged for a MAR or TSA project; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) Ensure research is undertaken to allow (in conjunction with the information gathered through the process described in (a) above) for the full assessment of the matters listed in (c) below.</u></p> <p><u>(c) Require that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. adverse effects on cultural values, including those associated with unnatural mixing of water are <u>satisfactorily avoided or mitigated;</u></li> <li>ii. adverse effects on the availability and quality of community drinking water supplies are avoided;</li> <li>iii. adverse effects on fish passage are avoided or mitigated;</li> <li>iv. Inundation of existing wetlands is avoided, remedied or mitigated through scheme design, constructions and</li> </ul>			

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>operation;</p> <p>v. <i>There is no net loss of significant biodiversity habitat of indigenous biodiversity; <del>and</del></i></p> <p>vi. <i>Adverse effects on people and property from raised groundwater levels and higher flows are avoided; <u>and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>vii. Adverse effects on farming activities and production are avoided.</u></i></p>			
Irrigation NZ	52278 V2 pLWRP - 175	Policy 13.4.14	<p>Amend to read:</p> <p><i><u>Enable managed aquifer recharge and targeted stream augmentation, where <u>adverse effects can be appropriately managed. In determining whether adverse effects can be appropriately managed Canterbury Regional Council will:</u></u></i></p> <p><i><u>(a) Encourage consultation to be undertaken with affected communities and landholders before any application is lodged for a MAR or TSA project; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>(b) Ensure research is undertaken to allow (in conjunction with the information gathered through the process described in (a) above) for the full</u></i></p>	Support in part	There is potential for increased flows and levels to adversely affect drainage in the lower catchment in the autumn through to spring. While increasing flows is an important part of the solutions package the potential for conflict/adverse effects on farming needs to be both acknowledged and carefully managed. Consultation with the community and land owners during development of projects will be valuable.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks splitting Policy 13.4.14 into two policies and encouraging consultation and research in relation to MAR projects.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p><u>assessment of the matters listed in (c) below.</u></p> <p><u>(c) Require that:</u></p> <p>adverse effects on cultural values, including those associated with unnatural mixing of water are <del>satisfactorily</del> avoided <u>or mitigated;</u></p> <p>ii. adverse effects on the availability and quality of community drinking water supplies are avoided;</p> <p>iii. adverse effects on fish passage are avoided or mitigated;</p> <p>iv. Inundation of existing wetlands is avoided, remedied or mitigated through scheme design, constructions and operation;</p> <p>v. There is no net loss of significant biodiversity habitat of indigenous biodiversity; <del>and</del></p> <p>vi. Adverse effects on people and property from raised groundwater levels and higher flows are avoided; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>vii. Adverse effects on farming.</u></p>			

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<u>activities and production are avoided.</u>			
Rangitata Diversion Race Management Limited	56706 V2 pLWRP-649	Policy 13.4.14	Paragraphs (b) and (f) require that adverse effects be avoided without qualification. Provisions should be redrafted so as to promote avoidance in the first instance, and remediation or mitigation if avoidance is not practical.	Support in part	“Avoidance” is a particularly high hurdle. While it is important that all potential adverse effects be recognised and managed, an “avoid only” policy could serve to preclude otherwise highly beneficial MAR and TSA projects.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks that adverse effects of MAR and TSA be avoided, remedied or mitigated.
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP - 293	Policy 13.4.14(e)	Amend as follows: (e) there is no net loss of significant <b>biodiversity</b> habitat of indigenous biodiversity	Support	Proposed wording does not make grammatical sense.	Accept the submission.

### Policy 13.4.16

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP-295	13.4.16	Amend as follows: <i>Improve flows in spring-fed waterbodies and the Lower Hinds River/Hekeao to meet economic cultural, social and environmental outcomes in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by requiring adherence to flow and allocation limits, <u>and</u> limiting the volume and rate of abstraction on replacement water permits to reasonable use calculated in accordance with</i>	Support in part	All methods set out in Schedule 10 of the pLWRP should be available to calculate reasonable use. The reasonable use test methodologies of Schedule 10 were the result of considerable work during the development of the Natural Resources Regional Plan and there is no apparent reason why they should not be used under Variation 2.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks that all the methods of Schedule 10 be available to calculate reasonable use.



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<i>method <del>set out</del> in Schedule 10 and prohibiting increased use arising from the transfer of consented volumes of water within surface water catchments and the Valetta Groundwater Allocation Zone <u>unless there is environmental benefit from doing so.</u></i>			
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-569	13.4.16	Amend as follows: <i>Improve flows in spring-fed waterbodies and the Lower Hinds River/Hekeao to meet economic cultural, social and environmental outcomes in the Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area by requiring adherence to flow and allocation limits, <u>and limiting the volume and rate of abstraction on replacement water permits to reasonable use calculated in accordance with method 1 in Schedule 10. <del>and prohibiting increased use arising from the transfer of consented volumes of water within surface water catchments and the Valetta Groundwater Allocation Zone.</del></u></i>	Support in Part	Although purporting to prohibit only those transfers that lead to increase water usage, the associated rules prohibit any transfer. There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. While this policy appears to recognise that, it does not follow through to the relevant rules. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition would be contrary to Policy B3 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.  The provisions of the pLWRP provide an adequate framework for managing transfers and this part of Policy 13.4.16 is superfluous (and misleading).	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of the words:  <i>“and prohibiting increased use arising from the transfer of consented volumes of water within surface water catchments and the Valetta Groundwater Allocation Zone”.</i>
Irrigation New Zealand Inc	52278 V2 pLWRP-179	13.4.16	Amend as follows: <i>Improve flows in spring-fed waterbodies and the Lower Hinds River/Hekeao to meet economic cultural, social and environmental outcomes in the Hinds/Hekeao</i>	Support in Part	Although purporting to prohibit only those transfers that lead to increase water usage, the associated rules prohibit any transfer. There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. While this policy appears to recognise that,	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of the words:  <i>“and prohibiting increased use arising from the transfer of</i>

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<i>Plains Area by requiring adherence to flow and allocation limits, and limiting the volume and rate of abstraction on replacement water permits to reasonable use calculated in accordance with method 12 in Schedule 10. <del>and prohibiting increased use arising from the transfer of consented volumes of water within surface water catchments and the Valetta Groundwater Allocation Zone.</del></i>		<p>it does not follow through to the relevant rules. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition would be contrary to Policy B3 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.</p> <p>The provisions of the pLWRP provide an adequate framework for managing transfers and this part of Policy 13.4.16 is superfluous (and misleading).</p>	<i>consented volumes of water within surface water catchments and the Valetta Groundwater Allocation Zone”.</i>

### Policy 13.4.18

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme	56798 V2 pLWRP-1095	13.4.18	Amend Policy 13.4.18 as follows: <i>In the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area, with the exception of the Lower Hinds River/Hekeao, <del>and until 30 June 2020</del>, any water permit granted to replace an existing water permit will be subject to the minimum flow and allocation limits in Table 13(e) <u>until there is a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime that has been included in the plan through a schedule 1 RMA process.</u></i>	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.
P Everest and	56669	13.4.18	Amend Policy 13.4.18 as follows:	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Others	V2 pLWRP-1125		<i>In the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area, with the exception of the Lower Hinds River/Hekeao, <del>and until 30 June 2020</del>, any water permit granted to replace an existing water permit will be subject to the minimum flow and allocation limits in Table 13(e) <u>until there is a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime that has been included in the plan through a schedule 1 RMA process.</u></i>		should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP-308	13.4.18	Amend Policy 13.4.18 by deleting the words " <i>and until 30 June 2020</i> ".	Support in part	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept that part of the submission that deletes the words " <i>and until 30 June 2020</i> ".
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-500	13.4.18	Retain Policy 13.4.18.	Oppose	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Reject the submission.

**Policy 13.4.19**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Director General of Conservation	53688 V2 pLWRP-429	13.4.19	Delete Policy 13.4.19	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.
Barrhill Chertsey Irrigation Scheme	56731 V2 pLWRP-486	13.4.19	Delete Policy 13.4.19	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-501	13.4.19	Retain Policy 13.4.19	Oppose	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Reject the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme Inc	56799 V2 pLWRP-1039	13.4.19	Delete Policy 13.4.19	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.
Ashburton Hinds Drainage Rating District Liaison Committee	56687 V2 pLWRP-1079	13.4.19	Minimum flow and allocation limits should continue as listed in Table 13(e) until there is a collaborative agreement achieved on individual drains by the Working Drains Party.	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme	56798 V2 pLWRP-1096	13.4.19	Delete Policy 13.4.19	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission.

**Rule 13.5.8**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-570	Rule 13.5.8	Delete condition 2	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds are primarily related to sediment, phosphorus and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream does need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the main risks to water quality are from run-off and riparian management rather than nitrogen leaching.	Accept the submission.
Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group	56707 V2 pLWRP-966	Rule 13.5.8	Delete condition 2	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds are primarily related to sediment, phosphorus and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream does need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the main risks to water quality are from run-off and riparian management rather than nitrogen leaching.	Accept the submission.
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme	56798 V2 pLWRP-1306	Rule 13.5.8	Delete condition 2	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds are primarily related to sediment, phosphorus and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream does need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the main risks to water quality are from run-off and riparian management rather than nitrogen leaching.	Accept the submission.
Synlait Milk Ltd	54491 V2 pLWRP-238	Rule 13.5.8	Delete condition 2	Support	Water quality risks in the Upper Hinds are primarily related to sediment, phosphorus and E. coli inputs rather than nitrogen. The risks	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream does need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the main risks to water quality are from run-off and riparian management rather than nitrogen leaching.	
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-506	Rule 13.5.8	Require farms to comply with a sustainable leaching rate on basis of either a flat per hectare leaching rate or on the basis of LUC.	Oppose	Proposal does not recognise different starting positions of farms or differing abilities to comply. Costs of compliance would therefore be highly variable.  Nitrogen is not, in any event, the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Reject the submission.

### **Rule 13.5.9**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group	56707 V2 pLWRP-967	Rule 13.5.9	Delete condition 1.	Support	Nitrogen is not the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Accept the submission.
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-571	Rule 13.5.9	Delete condition 1.	Support	Nitrogen is not the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Accept the submission.
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation	56798 V2 pLWRP-1289	Rule 13.5.9	Delete condition 1.	Support	Nitrogen is not the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Scheme						
Irrigation New Zealand Inc	52278 V2 pLWRP-187	Rule 13.5.9	Delete condition 1.	Support	Nitrogen is not the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Accept the submission.
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-507	Rule 13.5.9	Require farms to comply with a sustainable leaching rate on basis of either a flat per hectare leaching rate or on the basis of LUC.	Oppose	Proposal does not recognise different starting positions of farms or differing abilities to comply. Costs of compliance would therefore be highly variable.  Nitrogen is not, in any event, the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Reject the submission.

### **Rule 13.5.10**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-572	Rule 13.5.10	Delete Rule 13.5.10	Support	With the nitrogen baseline condition removed from Rules 13.5.8 and 13.5.9, Rule 13.5.10 is unnecessary and can be removed.	Accept the submission.
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-507	Rule 13.5.10	Require farms to comply with a sustainable leaching rate on basis of either a flat per hectare leaching rate or on the basis of LUC.	Oppose	Proposal does not recognise different starting positions of farms or differing abilities to comply. Costs of compliance would therefore be highly variable.  Nitrogen is not, in any event the main risk to water quality in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.	Reject the submission.



**Rule 13.5.14**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Ravensdown Fertiliser Co-operative Limited	56708 V2 pLWRP-754	Rule 13.5.14	Delete the Rule and amend Rules 13.5.15 – 13.5.18 and Rule 13.5.22 that follow by deleting any reference to Rule 13.5.14.	Support	The rule potentially allows for further land use intensification when existing intensive farming activities are already faced with significant reduction expectations. Land that is already within the command area of a consented irrigation scheme should be provided for in the Variation (even where land use change has yet to occur) but this is adequately achieved by Rules 13.5.21 and 13.5.32.	Accept the submission.
Fish and Game Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-513	Rule 13.5.14	Delete rule and replace with a rule that requires farms to comply with a sustainable leaching rate on basis of either a flat per hectare leaching rate or on the basis of LUC.	Oppose	Proposal does not recognise different starting positions of farms, different farms systems or differing abilities to comply. Costs of compliance would therefore be highly variable.	Reject the submission.

**Rule 13.5.15**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP - 322	Rule 13.5.15	Amend Variation 2 to provide for a flexibility cap (similar to the South Canterbury Coastal Streams proposal) and include in Rule 13.5.15.	Support in part	Farming activity that has a low nitrogen discharge should not be limited to its nitrogen baseline but be allowed some flexibility to increase up to a cap as a permitted activity to allow for seasonal variation and to help maintain viability as circumstances change. The limit of this flexibility cap needs to be set at a level that does not place an excessive additional N loss reduction burden on existing	Accept that part of the submission seeking that the rule provides for a flexibility cap(s) (with the parameters to be determined).

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					high nitrogen discharges.	
Fish and Game Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-514	Rule 13.5.15	Delete rule and replace with a rule that requires farms to comply with a sustainable leaching rate on basis of either a flat per hectare leaching rate or on the basis of LUC.	Oppose	Proposal does not recognise different starting positions of farms, different farms systems or differing abilities to comply. Costs of compliance would therefore be highly variable.	Reject the submission.

### **Rule 13.5.16**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP - 324	Rule 13.5.16	Amend Variation to provide for a flexibility cap (similar to the South Canterbury Coastal Streams proposal) and include in Rule 13.5.15	Support in part	With regard to the relationship between condition 1 and 2, a farming activity that has a low nitrogen discharge should not be limited to its nitrogen baseline but be allowed some flexibility to increase up to a cap as a permitted activity to allow for seasonal variation and to help maintain viability as circumstances change.  The limit of this flexibility cap needs to be set at a level that does not place an excessive additional N loss reduction burden on existing high nitrogen discharges.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks that the rule provide for a flexibility cap(s) (with the parameters to be determined).
Fish and Game Central South Island	52271 V2 pLWRP-578	Rule 13.5.16	Amend the Rule so that the activity status is controlled as the rule covers both s9 and s15 land use and associated discharges.	Oppose	Controlled activity status is unnecessary for low leaching activities.	Reject the submission.

**Rule 13.5.17**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-579	Rule 13.5.17	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>From 1 January 2017, the use of land for a farming activity in the Lower Hinds/ Hekeao Plains Area is a restricted discretionary activity, provided the following conditions are met:</i></p> <p><i>1. The nitrogen loss calculation for the property is greater than <del>2025</del> kgs per hectare per annum; and</i></p> <p><i>2. The nitrogen loss calculation for the property, excluding any area of land subject to a resource consent granted under Rule 13.5.14, does not increase above the nitrogen baseline; <del>and/or</del></i></p> <p><i><u>3. The property is within that area shown as Green on the LWRP Planning Maps and the nitrogen loss calculation for the property, excluding any area of land subject to resource consent granted under Rule 13.5.14, does not exceed the nitrogen baseline plus 5kgs per hectare per annum, whichever is greater; and</u></i></p> <p><i>4 A Farm Environment Plan has been prepared in accordance with Schedule 7 Part A, and supplied to Environment Canterbury on</i></p>	Support	<p>A change to 25kgs is required if the changes sought are made to Rule 13.5.15</p> <p>With regard to matter of discretion 2, requiring compliance with a “locked in” load target is inappropriate when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).</p> <p>If relief sought in relation to Rule 13.5.14 is accepted, reference in Rule 13.5.17 to Rule 13.5.14 needs to be deleted.</p> <p>With regard to matter of discretion 3, good management practice rates currently do not exist and their appropriateness therefore cannot be tested.</p> <p>With regard to matter of discretion 4, the same percentage reduction target should apply equally to all farming activities above the flexibility cap. Criteria are required to guide decision-making as to how this key discretion will be exercised.</p>	Accept the submission together with any consequential changes as may be necessary.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>request.</p> <p>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The quality of, compliance with and auditing of the Farm Environmental Plan; and</li> <li><del>2. The ability to meet the nitrogen load target for farming activities in Table 13(g); and</del></li> <li>3. From 1 January 2017 the implementation of <del>g</del>Good management <del>p</del>Practices <del>Nitrogen Loss Rates to be applied for the baseline land uses; and</del></li> <li><del>4. For the period after 1 January 2020, the matters listed in Policy 13.4.13. Any nitrogen loss rates to be applied in accordance with Table 13 (h); and</del></li> <li>5. The potential benefits of the activity to the applicant, the community and the environment.</li> </ol>			
Irrigation New Zealand Inc		Rule 13.5.17	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The exercise of discretion is restricted to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The quality of, compliance with and auditing of the Farm Environmental Plan; and</li> <li><del>2. The ability to meet the nitrogen load target for farming activities in Table 13(g); and</del></li> </ol>	Support	<p>Requiring compliance with a “locked in” load target is inappropriate when there is uncertainty as to its validity or when the calculation may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer).</p> <p>With regard to matter of discretion 4, the same percentage reduction target should apply equally to all farming activities above the flexibility cap. Criteria are required to guide decision-making as to how this key discretion</p>	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>3. From 1 January 2017 the implementation of Good management Practices Nitrogen Loss Rates to be applied for the baseline land uses; and</p> <p>4. <u>For the period after 1 January 2020, the matters listed in Policy 13.4.13. Any nitrogen loss rates to be applied in accordance with Table 13 (h); and</u></p> <p>5. The potential benefits of the activity to the applicant, the community and the environment.</p>		<p>will be exercised.</p> <p>If relief sought in relation to Rule 13.5.14 is accepted, reference in Rule 13.5.17 to Rule 13.5.14 needs to be deleted.</p>	
Fish and Game Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-543	Rule 13.5.17	<p>Include within the rule requirements to achieve the nitrogen reductions set out in table 13(h).</p> <p>Deletion of clause 3 and 4.</p>	Oppose	The extent and timing of N loss reductions is an appropriate matter over which to exercise discretion given the wide range of circumstances that will determine what is appropriate in any individual case. Imposed as standard ("requirement" of the rule) would result in highly variable and unnecessary costs.	Reject the submission.

### Rule 13.5.22

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP-332	Rule 13.5.22	<p>Delete Condition 3,</p> <p>Set realistic targets for reduction in N discharge, with regard to both quantity and timeframes and amend Tables 13(h) and 13(i)</p>	Support	There should be no provision for additional intensification that results in increased nitrogen loss (exceeding the flexibility cap) over and above that enabled by existing resource consents with nitrogen limits as held by	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			accordingly.		irrigation companies. That being the case, and because we propose Rule 13.514 be deleted, Condition 3 is unnecessary.	
Effielton Community Irrigation Scheme	56798 V2 pLWRP-1302	Rule 13.5.22	Delete Condition 3. Set realistic targets for reduction in N discharge, with regard to both quantity and timeframes and amend Tables 13(h) and 13(i) accordingly.	Support	There should be no provision for additional intensification that results in increased nitrogen loss (exceeding the flexibility cap) over and above that enabled by existing resource consents with nitrogen limits as held by irrigation companies. That being the case, and because we propose Rule 13.514 be deleted, Condition 3 is unnecessary.	Accept the submission.
Nga Rununga and te Rununga O Ngai Tahu	52233 V2 pLWRP-247	Rule 13.5.22	Delete Rule 13.5.22(3) and replace with a new condition aimed at ensuring “the nitrogen loss calculation for the total area of land will not exceed the nitrogen baseline for land uses established or resource consents granted to establish land uses on or before 27 September 2014...” And any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the decisions requested	Support in part	There should be no provision for additional intensification that results in increased nitrogen loss (exceeding the flexibility cap) over and above that enabled by existing resource consents with nitrogen limits as held by irrigation companies.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks to limit N loss increases to that area in respect of which consents enabling the establishment of new uses have already been granted (and the consequential amendments required to give effect to that decision).
Dairy Holdings Limited	53683 V2 pLWRP-997	Rule 13.5.22	Delete Condition 2 and 3 (and Table 13(i)) and replace with a cross reference to specific loads and/or area to be set out in a separate table with entries for	Support in part	There should be no provision for additional intensification that results in increased nitrogen loss (exceeding the flexibility cap) over and above that enabled by existing resource consents with nitrogen limits as held by	Accept that part of the submission that seeks to delete condition 3 and cross references to a table that limits N loss increases to that

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			each irrigation scheme.		irrigation companies. That being the case, and because we propose Rule 13.514 be deleted, Condition 3 is unnecessary.	area served by specific irrigation schemes.

### ***Rule 13.5.30 (Condition 1)***

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Ltd	56723 V2 pLWRP-411	Rule 13.5.30 condition 1	Delete Rule 13.5.30 OR Amend Rule 13.5.30(1) by deleting "Method 1 in". Any consequential amendments	Support in part	Schedule 10 provides three accepted methods by which "reasonable use" can be calculated. It is inappropriate to limit this to method 1 in this rule.	Accept the submission.

### ***Rule 13.5.31 (Condition 1)***

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Valetta Irrigation Limited	56723 V2 pLWRP-679	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Delete condition entirely.	Support in part	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water take is to be surrendered.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of the words " <i>The groundwater take will be abstracted on the same property as the existing resource consent and</i> ".
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-587	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Delete the words " <i>The groundwater take will be abstracted on the same property</i> "	Support	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<i>as the existing resource consent and”.</i>		take is to be surrendered.	
Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Ltd	56723 V2 pLWRP-391	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Delete condition entirely.	Support in part	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water take is to be surrendered.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of the words <i>“The groundwater take will be abstracted on the same property as the existing resource consent and”.</i>
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP-352	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Delete the words <i>“The groundwater take will be abstracted on the same property as the existing resource consent and”.</i>	Support	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water take is to be surrendered.	Accept the submission.
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP - 339	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Amend Rule 13.5.31 to allow abstraction from different properties if the outcomes are positive.	Support	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water take is to be surrendered.	Accept the submission.
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme Inc	56799 V2 pLWRP-1062	Rule 13.5.31 Condition 1.	Delete the words <i>“The groundwater take will be abstracted on the same property as the existing resource consent and”.</i>  OR Re-write condition to refer to water use rather than “take” and “abstracted”.	Support	Benefits can accrue even if the groundwater will be abstracted from a different property from that where the existing surface water take is to be surrendered.	Accept the submission.



**Rule 13.5.31 (Matter of discretion 1)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Valetta Irrigation Limited	56723 V2 pLWRP-696	Rule 13.5.31 Matter of discretion 1.	Delete reference to “Method 1 in”.	Support in part	Schedule 10 provides three accepted methods by which “reasonable use” can be calculated. It is inappropriate to limit this to method 1 in this rule.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks that any of the three methods of Schedule 10 may be used to determine “reasonable use”.
Synlait Milk Ltd	56631 V2 pLWRP-268	Rule 13.5.31 Matter of discretion 1.	Amend to (amongst other things) delete reference to “method 1”	Support in part	Schedule 10 provides three accepted methods by which “reasonable use” can be calculated. It is inappropriate to limit this to method 1 in this rule.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks that any of the three methods of Schedule 10 may be used to determine “reasonable use”.
Mayfield Hinds Irrigation Ltd	56723 V2 pLWRP-412	Rule 13.5.31 Matter of discretion 1.	Delete reference to “Method 1 in”.	Support	Schedule 10 provides three accepted methods by which “reasonable use” can be calculated. It is inappropriate to limit this to method 1 in this rule.	Accept the submission.

**Rule 13.5.33**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Dairy NZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-588	Rule 13.5.33	Delete	Support	There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					of transfers in circumstances where there would be no additional adverse effects but greater allocative efficiency would be contrary to Policies B3 and B4 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.	
Irrigation NZ	52278 V2-pLWRP-198	Rule 13.5.33	Delete	Support	There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition of transfers in circumstances where there would be no additional adverse effects but greater allocative efficiency would be contrary to Policies B3 and B4 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.	Accept the submission.

**Rule 13.5.34**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Dairy NZ	52271 V2 pLWRP-589	Rule 13.5.33	Delete	Support	There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition of transfers in circumstances where there would be no additional adverse effects but greater allocative efficiency would be contrary to Policies B3 and B4 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Irrigation NZ	52278 V2-pLWRP-204	Rule 13.5.33	Delete	Support	There are circumstances when transfer will not have negative effects on water usage and may have positive in-stream effects. Transfer is generally something to be encouraged to provide for allocative efficiency. Prohibition of transfers in circumstances where there would be no additional adverse effects but greater allocative efficiency would be contrary to Policies B3 and B4 of the NPS for Freshwater Management 2014.	Accept the submission.

**Table 13(e)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Irrigation New Zealand Inc	52278 V2 pLWRP-185	Table 13(e)	In Table 13(e) delete reference to 2020 and replace with 2035	Support in part	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks deletion of reference to 2020.
Federated Farmers Combined Canterbury Branch	51457 V2 pLWRP-309	Table 13(e)	Delete the words "1 October 2014 - 30 June 2020" from the heading of columns 4 and 5 of Table 13(e).	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	
Director General of Conservation	53688 V2 pLWRP-467	Table 13(e)	Delete <i>1 October 2014-30 June 2020</i> from the heading of Table 13(e) Otherwise retain Table 13(e)	Support in part	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept that part of the submission that proposes changes to the table heading.
Barrhill Chertsey Irrigation Scheme	56731 V2 pLWRP-488	Table 13(e)	In Table 13(e) delete reference to <i>1 October 2014-30 June 2020</i> Include advice note stating: <i>The replacement of an existing water permit that complies with the minimum flow and allocation limits referred to in Policy 13.4.18 and Table 13(e) will be a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 5.132</i>	Support in part	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept that part of the submission that proposes changes to the table heading.
Fish and Game Council Central South Island	53274 V2 pLWRP-505	Table 13(e)	Retain Table 13(e) and review in 2020.	Oppose	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Reject the submission.
Eiffelton	56799	Table 13(e)	Delete " <i>1 October 2014 - 30 June</i>	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime	Accept the submission

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Community Group Irrigation Scheme Inc	V2 pLWRP-1041		2020" from Table 13(e)		should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	
Eiffelton Community Group Irrigation Scheme	56798 V2 pLWRP-1108	Table 13(e)	Amend Table 13(e) by deleting "1 October 2014 to 30 June 2020"	Support	The status quo flow and allocation regime should apply until such time as a collaboratively developed flow and allocation regime and the methods to achieve the regime (regulatory or non-regulatory) have been explored by the Hinds Drains Working Party, then any required changes to the flow and allocation regime included in the Plan by way of the Schedule 1 RMA process.	Accept the submission

**Table 13(g)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Upper Hinds Plains Land User Group	56730 V2 pLWRP - 973	Table 13(g)	Insert a new Table of concentration objectives/limits for the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area	Support	Specification of concentration objectives/limits is more appropriate in the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area than a nitrogen load limit.	Accept the submission.
DairyNZ	522271 V2 pLWRP-594, 595 & 596.	Table 13(g)	Delete the N load limit for the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area and replace the fixed load limit for the Lower Plains Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area with a	Support	Water quality issues in the Upper Hinds are related to sediment, phosphorus and E.coli issues rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream do need to be managed (alongside	Accept the submissions.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>formula of 70% of the current N load contributed from farming activities.</p> <p>Include new proposed Table 13(ga) with concentration objectives/limits for the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area.</p>		<p>other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the load limits approach is unnecessary as N loss risk can be managed through the Schedule 24a and Farm Environment Plan mechanisms and through specification of freshwater objectives (contaminant concentrations) in a new Table 13(ga).</p> <p>A “fixed” N load limit in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area is inappropriate given that it is based on an assessment of current load that is uncertain and which may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer). Because the understanding of the 2013-2014 load will evolve over time, the N load limit needs to be expressed in such a way that it to may change.</p>	
Irrigation New Zealand Inc	52278 V2 pLWRP-208	Table 13(g)	<p>Delete the N load limit for the Upper Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area (114 tonnes)</p> <p>Delete the N load limit for the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area and replace with a concentration OR a target load methodology</p>	Support	<p>Water quality issues in the Upper Hinds are related to sediment, phosphorus and E.coli issues rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream do need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the load limits approach is unnecessary as N loss risk can be managed through the Schedule 24a and Farm Environment Plan mechanisms and through specification of freshwater objectives (contaminant concentrations) in a new Table 13(ga).</p> <p>A “fixed” N load limit in the Lower Hinds/ Hekeao Plains Area is inappropriate given that</p>	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
					it is based on an assessment of current load that is uncertain and which may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer). Because the understanding of the 2013-2014 load will evolve over time, the N load limit needs to be expressed in such a way that it to may change.	
Synlait Milk Ltd	54491 V2 pLWRP-269	Table 13(g)	Amend the N load for the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area to be 70% of the existing catchment load	Support	<p>Water quality issues in the Upper Hinds are related to sediment, phosphorus and E.coli issues rather than nitrogen. The risks associated with nitrogen concentrations in-stream do need to be managed (alongside other contaminants that adversely affect values) but the load limits approach is unnecessary as N loss risk can be managed through the Schedule 24a and Farm Environment Plan mechanisms and through specification of freshwater objectives (contaminant concentrations) in a new Table 13(ga).</p> <p>A “fixed” N load limit in the Lower Hinds/Hekeao Plains Area is inappropriate given that it is based on an assessment of current load that is uncertain and which may change over time (due to, for example, updating of Overseer). Because the understanding of the 2013-2014 load will evolve over time, the N load limit needs to be expressed in such a way that it to may change.</p>	Accept the submission.

**Table 13(h)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
DairyNZ	52271 V2 pLWRP - 597	Table 13(h)	Amend Table 13(h) so that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Farming activities with a nitrogen loss calculation for a property of greater than 25kg/ha/yr are required to reduce N loss by 15%, 22% and 30% from GMP by 2025, 2030 and 2035 respectively; and</li> <li>▪ Farming activities with a nitrogen loss calculation for a property of less than 25kg/ha/yr are not required to reduce N loss beyond GMP.</li> </ul>	Support	A 45% percent reduction is not required to meet desired water quality outcomes provided MAR and TSA are implemented. With those measures 30% reduction is sufficient to achieve water quality outcomes sought by the variation.  Reduction obligations should be shouldered across all contributors with the highest reductions to be achieved by the highest emitters regardless of the land use type/ farming system.	Accept the submission.
Valetta Irrigation Ltd	56723 V2 pLWRP - 669	Table 13(h)	Amend Table 13(h) to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• require reduction in N loss from all farming activities down to a specified level;</li> <li>• decrease percentage reductions;</li> <li>• extend the time period;</li> <li>• include a proviso that further reductions are not required if water quality outcomes are being met and/or if further reductions from any particular activity will not contribute to further water quality improvements</li> </ul>	Support in part	A 45% percent reduction is not required to meet desired water quality outcomes provided MAR and TSA are implemented. With those measures 30% reduction is sufficient to achieve water quality outcomes sought by the variation.  Reduction obligations should be shouldered across all contributors with the highest reductions to be achieved by the highest emitters regardless of the land use type/ farming system.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks amendment to Table 13(h) to treat all farming activities the same and decrease the percentage reductions to a specified level.
Mayfield	56712	Table 13(h)	Amend Table 13(h) to	Support in	A 45% percent reduction is not required	Accept that part of the



Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Hinds Irrigation Ltd	V2 pLWRP - 374		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ require reduction in N loss from all farming activities down to a specified level</li> <li>▪ decrease percentage reductions</li> <li>▪ extend the time period</li> <li>▪ include a proviso that further reductions are not required if water quality outcomes are being met and/or if further reductions from any particular activity will not contribute to further water quality improvements</li> <li>▪ Provide for 5 yearly reviews of any reduction proposed to ensure they are still appropriate to achieve the nitrogen load limit in Table 13(g) or other relevant water quality attributes of the load target is deleted.</li> </ul>	part	<p>to meet desired water quality outcomes provided MAR and TSA are implemented. With those measures a less reduction is sufficient to achieve water quality outcomes sought by the variation.</p> <p>Reduction obligations should be shouldered across all contributors with the highest reductions to be achieved by the highest emitters regardless of the land use type/ farming system.</p> <p>Ongoing reviews of reduction requirements are essential.</p>	submission that seeks amendment to Table 13(h) to treat all farming activities the same; decrease the percentage reductions to a specified level and provide for 5 yearly reviews.
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP - 351	Table 13(h)	<p>Require N loss rates based on Overseer to be adjusted with Overseer version and protocol changes.</p> <p>Remove “dairy” and “dairy support” categories.</p> <p>Plan amended to require continuation of provisions for no increase of baseline losses until GMP and MGM definitions</p>	Support in part	<p>A 45% percent reduction is not required to meet desired water quality outcomes provided MAR and TSA are implemented. With those measures a lesser reduction is sufficient to achieve water quality outcomes sought by the variation.</p> <p>Reduction obligations should be shouldered across all contributors with the highest reductions to be achieved by the highest emitters regardless of the land</p>	Accept that part of the submission that seeks amendment to Table 13(h) to treat all farming activities the same; decrease the percentage reductions 30% by 2035; and seeks review once GMP and MGM have been defined and

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
			<p>released.</p> <p>Plan then needs to be reviewed to adopt calculated farm reduction targets once GMP and MGM have been defined and released.</p> <p>Plan also needs to review and set timetables for reduction once relative capabilities for reduction established.</p> <p>Table needs to include permitted activity provisions of 13.5.16 in regard to 20kg.</p> <p>Plan to require a target of 30% of reduction in N loss rates by 2035 with a lower limit for reductions of 27kg/ha.</p>		<p>use type/ farming system.</p> <p>Ongoing reviews of reduction requirements are essential.</p>	released.
Irrigation NZ	52278 V2 pLWRP - 209	Table 13(h)	<p>Amend Table 13(h) so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Farming activities with a nitrogen loss calculation for a property of greater than 27kg/ha/yr are required to reduce N loss by 15%, 20% and 26% from GMP by 2020, 2027 and 2035 respectively; and</li> <li>▪ Farming activities with a nitrogen loss calculation for a property of less than 27kg/ha/yr are not required to reduce N loss beyond GMP</li> </ul>	Support in part	We support this submission to the extent that it seeks to treat all farm activities the same (i.e. there should be no land use discrimination when setting N loss requirements) and it sets a level below which reductions are not required.	Accept that part of the submission that seeks provisions that treat all farming activities the same and specify a level below which reductions are not required.
Dairy Holdings Ltd	53683 V2 pLWRP -	Table 13(h)	Include a policy or rule that ensures that any reference to a	Support	We support policy that provides for continuous review of the limits and N loss	Accept the submission.

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
	1011		percent reduction in N loss (as well references to any other targets/limits) remain appropriate – including the possibility of a further plan change following the comprehensive and detailed investigation (i.e. while ensuring farming activities can retain an acceptable level of profitability).		requirements; and that ceases the obligation to reduce N loss when in-stream/groundwater outcomes are being met (allowing for lag times).	

**Table 13(i)**

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Rangitata Diversion Race Management Limited	56706 V2 pLWRP - 707	Table 13(i)	Delete the reference to 27 kgN/ha/yr from Part B of Table 13(i) and replace It with a robust rate (or rates) that is (are) derived in accordance with the methodology set out in Annexure C;	Support in part	Revised cap on farming activities within irrigation schemes is required to allow for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A flexibility cap to operate; and</li> <li>• The equal treatment of properties within and outside irrigation schemes.</li> </ul>	Accept that part of the submission that seeks to replace the 27kgs limit with an alternative rate.
Hinds Plains Land and Water Partnership	56730 V2 pLWRP- 356	Table 13(i)	Review the Variation to adopt calculated farm or scheme targets once Good Management Practice and Matrix of Good Management Practice have been defined and released	Support in part	Good Management Practice Nitrogen Loss rates do not currently exist. It is inappropriate to refer to, and base future reductions on, a rate of N loss that is currently unknown (and the cost of practicality of which cannot therefore be assessed).	Accept that part of the submission that seeks reference to Good Management Practice Nitrogen Loss Rates be deleted until such time as such rates are known.
Barhill Chertsey Irrigation	56731 V2 pLWRP- 525	Table 13(i)	Amend Table 13 (i) on the basis that (i) the reductions for existing	Support in part	Good Management Practice Nitrogen Loss rates do not currently exist. It is inappropriate to refer to, and base future	Accept that part of the submission that seeks reference to Good

Submitter Name	Submission Number	Variation 2 reference	Submission	Support/ Oppose	Reasons	Relief Sought
Scheme			irrigated land (Row A) will be determined by future plan change following introduction of Good Management regime		reductions on, a rate of N loss that is currently unknown (and the cost of practicality of which cannot therefore be assessed).	Management Practice Nitrogen Loss Rates be deleted until such time as such rates are known.